

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application with claims 1 – 6 being amended by this response. Claims 1 – 6 have been formally amended to claim a composition. Additionally, claims 1 – 6 have been formally amended to improve readability and to eliminate any antecedent basis problems. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification and the originally filed claims. Therefore, no new matter is being added by these claim amendments.

**Rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35 USC § 101**

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility. Specifically, the Rejection states that the Applicant claims multiple inventions within a single claim. Claim 1 is amended by this response to more clearly claim that Applicants invention is directed towards a “composition comprising a combination of pseudoephedrine sulphate and domperidone”. Claims 2 – 6 are also formally amended to conform with the amendments made in claim 1. Therefore, as claims 1 – 6 are now directed towards a composition, the present claimed invention possesses patentable utility. Consequently, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes that a further rejection under 35 USC 101 is made under the section heading for the Rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. However, this apparent rejection is discussed hereinbelow. Claims 1 – 6 are rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process and therefore is improper. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is moot because claims 1 – 6 have been amended to recite a composition and not a method (or process). Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Rejection of Claim 1 – 6 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph**

Claims 1 – 6 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 – 6 have been amended to claim a “composition comprising a combination of pseudoephedrine sulphate and domperidone”. Therefore, in view of the amendments to claims 1 – 6, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 – 6 satisfy the requirements of 35 USC 112, second paragraph and particularly point out and distinctly claim a composition. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

Having fully addressed the Examiner’s rejections, it is believed that, in view of the amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant’s attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No additional fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the fee to Deposit Account 50-2828.

Respectfully submitted,  
Augusto Larrin Orrego

By: 

Jesse R. Bucholtz  
Reg. No. 55,027  
Tel. No.: (212) 971-0416

Jack Schwartz & Associates, PLLC  
245 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 1902  
New York, NY 10016  
Tel: (212) 971-0416  
Fax: (212) 971-0417  
November 9, 2009